



**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of:  
Gallagher et al.

: Attorney Docket No.: DN 50824-5

Serial No.: 10/782,657

: Confirmation No.: 5492

Filed: February 19, 2004

: Group Art Unit: 1756

For: ELECTRONIC DEVICE MANUFACTURE

: Examiner: Caleen O. Sullivan

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Sir:

In response to the Official Action issued April 4, 2007, applicants submit the following remarks.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, in light of the remarks which follow are respectfully requested.

As correctly noted in the Office Action Summary, claims 15-24 are pending in the application.

Turning now to the Official Action, claims 15-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,263) in view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. 6,420,441), and further in view of Huang (U.S. Patent No. 6,150,073). While applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection, the rejection has been obviated by the attached Statement Under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), stating that Allen does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-24 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,596,467 in view of Allen. Without addressing the propriety of this rejection, the